

1  
2  
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 \* \* \*

6 Michael Buchna,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 Walmart Inc., et al.,

10 Defendants.

Case No. 2:21-cv-00061-RFB-DJA

11 **ORDER**

12 This matter is before the Court on the parties' Stipulated Protective Order (ECF No. 17),  
13 filed on December 22, 2021. The parties request that the Court enter a protective order to govern  
14 their exchange of confidential information. However, the parties fail to state the governing  
15 standard for filing documents under seal with the Court. This order reminds counsel that there is  
16 a presumption of public access to judicial files and records. A party seeking to file a confidential  
17 document under seal must file a motion to seal and must comply with the Ninth Circuit's  
18 directives in *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006) and  
19 *Center for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Group, LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1097 (9th Cir. 2016).

20 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the parties' Stipulated Protective Order (ECF No.  
21 17) is **granted subject to the following modifications**:

- 22 • The Court has adopted electronic filing procedures. Attorneys must file  
23 documents under seal using the Court's electronic filing procedures. *See* Local  
24 Rule IA 10-5. Papers filed with the Court under seal must be accompanied with a  
25 concurrently-filed motion for leave to file those documents under seal. *See* Local  
26 Rule IA 10-5(a).
- 27 • The Court has approved the instant protective order to facilitate discovery  
28 exchanges, but there has been no showing, and the Court has not found, that any  
specific documents are secret or confidential. The parties have not provided

1 specific facts supported by declarations or concrete examples to establish that a  
2 protective order is required to protect any specific trade secret or other confidential  
3 information pursuant to Rule 26(c) or that disclosure would cause an identifiable  
4 and significant harm.

- 5 • All motions to seal shall address the standard articulated in *Ctr. for Auto Safety*  
6 and explain why that standard has been met. 809 F.3d at 1097.
- 7 • Specifically, a party seeking to seal judicial records bears the burden of meeting  
8 the “compelling reasons” standard, as previously articulated in *Kamakana*. 447  
9 F.3d 1172. Under the compelling reasons standard, “a court may seal records only  
10 when it finds ‘a compelling reason and articulate[s] the factual basis for its ruling,  
11 without relying on hypothesis or conjecture.’” *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at  
12 1097. (quoting *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179). “The court must then  
13 ‘conscientiously balance[ ] the competing interests of the public and the party who  
14 seeks to keep certain judicial records secret.’” *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at  
15 1097.
- 16 • There is an exception to the compelling reasons standard where a party may satisfy  
17 the less exacting “good cause” standard for sealed materials attached to a  
18 discovery motion unrelated to the merits of the case. *Id.* “The good cause  
19 language comes from Rule 26(c)(1), which governs the issuance of protective  
20 orders in the discovery process: ‘The court may, for good cause, issue an order to  
21 protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue  
22 burden or expense.’” *Id.* (citing Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(c)). “For good cause to exist, the  
23 party seeking protection bears the burden of showing specific prejudice or harm  
24 will result if no protective order is granted.” *Phillips v. General Motors*, 307 F.3d  
25 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002).
- 26 • The labels of “dispositive” and “nondispositive” will not be the determinative  
27 factor for deciding which test to apply because the focal consideration is “whether  
28

1 the motion is more than tangentially related to the merits of a case.” *Ctr. for Auto*  
2 *Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1101.

- 3 • The fact that the Court has entered the instant stipulated protective order and that a  
4 party has designated a document as confidential pursuant to that protective order  
5 does not, standing alone, establish sufficient grounds to seal a filed document. *See*  
6 *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1133 (9th Cir. 2003); *see*  
7 *also Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int’l Ins. Co.*, 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992). If  
8 the sole ground for a motion to seal is that the opposing party (or non-party) has  
9 designated a document as confidential, the designator shall file (within seven days  
10 of the filing of the motion to seal) either (1) a declaration establishing sufficient  
11 justification for sealing each document at issue or (2) a notice of withdrawal of the  
12 designation(s) and consent to unsealing. If neither filing is made, the Court may  
13 order the document(s) unsealed without further notice.
- 14 • To the extent any aspect of the stipulated protective order may conflict with this  
15 order or Local Rule IA 10-5, that aspect of the stipulated protective order is hereby  
16 superseded with this order.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 DATED: December 28, 2021.



19  
20 DANIEL J. ALBREGTS  
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28